

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-11 are pending. Claims 4 and 6 have been canceled. Claims 10 and 11 are new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakajima *et al.* The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

The invention of claim 1 includes the feature of blocking a slit in a mounting base portion of a weather strip with a blocking member. The patent to Nakajima *et al.* discloses a molded portion being formed in the back side of a hollow seal portion of an extruded section of trim material. As explained below, the patent to Nakajima *et al.* fails to show all the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, that the blocking member is a separate and independent part from the mounting base portion. The office action indicates that the molded part 30 is a blocking member. However, the molded part 30 is not a separate and independent part from the mounting base part, since the molded part 30 of Nakajima *et al.* is molded to the trim 11. Therefore, the terms of claim 1 are not satisfied by the patent to Nakajima *et al.*

Although the office action asserts that the Nakajima *et al.* reference shows an insertion portion and a base portion of a blocking member, the office action fails to identify these parts other than by a vague reference to Figs. 2-6. If this rejection is repeated, the applicants respectfully request an identification of the part of Nakajima *et al.* that is supposed to correspond to the claimed insertion portion and base portion of the blocking member.

Further, claim 1 recites a lock portion, which is locked on an inner surface of the mounting base portion and which faces the hollow portion. The limitation of the lock portion formerly appeared in claim 5. However, in the rejection of claim 5, the office action fails to identify what part of the Nakajima *et al.* apparatus is the lock portion. The office action merely points to "figures 3 and 6." It is impossible to know what part of the Nakajima *et al.* apparatus is supposed to correspond to the claimed lock portion from the office action. Again, if this rejection is repeated, the applicants respectfully request an identification of the part of Nakajima *et al.* that is supposed to provide the claimed lock portion.


Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-9 depend on claim 1, directly or indirectly, and are thus considered to be patentable over Nakajima *et al.* for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 are new. Claims 10 and 11 depend indirectly on claim 1 and are thus considered to be patentable over Nakajima *et al.* for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James E. Barlow  
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Customer No. 23400